UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|--|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/550,197 | 09/21/2005 | Young-Taek Sul | P57672 | 7327 |
| | 7590 08/24/200 J SHNELL & LAW FI | EXAMINER | | |
| 2029 K STREE | | LEWIS, RALPH A | | |
| SUITE 600 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1004 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3732 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/24/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/550,197 | SUL, YOUNG-TAEK | |
| | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |

| | Ralph A. Lewis | 3732 | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 11 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidaviral (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE). | g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII | on. LED WITHIN TWO | | | | | |
| have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrumer 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett | sideration and/or search (see NOTw); | TE below); | | | | | | |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | mpliant Amendment (l | PTOL-324). | | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allo non-allowable claim(s). | · | • | _ | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | i be entered and an e. | xpianation of | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | ıl and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a | | | | | |
| 10. | | • | | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | | | |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | | | |
| | /Ralph A. Lewis/ Primary Examiner, Art U | nit 3732 | | | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it is not found persuasive. Applicant's argument that the Cuilleron threading is not helical (or obviously helical) is not found persuasive in light of the repeated statements in the reference that the implant is screwed into bone tissue. Moreover, contrary to applicant's assertions, the threads illustrated in Figure 5 are not symetrical, but rather slanted with respect to the axis of the implant..